



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1430  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,952	07/09/1999	LAURENCE R. BROTHERS	99-803	8993

32127 7590 07/17/2003

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.  
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSON  
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE  
MAILCODE HQEO3HO1  
IRVING, TX 75038

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. <b>09/350,952</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Brothers</b>
Examiner <b>Cuong H. Nguyen</b>	Art Unit <b>3625</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/01/2003 (the Change of Address request).
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-33 and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- 15)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      18)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      19)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_      20)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the Change of Address request received on 4/01/2003, which paper has been placed of record.
2. Claims 1-33, 35-43 are pending in this application.

### **Response:**

3. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 2/19/2003 with respect to claims 1-33, 35-43 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the following new ground(s) of rejections.

On page 9, para.3 of the amendment (received on 2/19/203), applicant asserts that "There is no teaching or suggestion in Schumacher et al. to provide ordering or payment method information used to buy or sell entries in a catalog", and in para.4, page 9, the applicant asserts that "There is no teaching or suggestion in Heck for an electronic catalog having entries that can be bought or sold by a user using ordering or payment information in the catalog". The examiner submits that since this is an "electronic document" claim, above arguments for different intend of uses would be obvious applications of an electronic document for one with ordinary skill in the art.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

5. Re. claims 1-33, 35-43: These claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schumacher et al.** (US Pat. 6,269,446), in view of **Mike Heck**, further in view of **Ginter et al., & Dana Mackenzie**.

A. Re. to Claim 1:

**Schumacher et al.** obviously suggest about authenticity a catalog document; further to organize files on an Internet server for distribution; **Mike Heck** suggests that a software name FileCenter 1.0 (a Web file cataloging application) was used to modify a header, a footer, and a body style of a page (this obviously includes identifying elements of a page, including a header, a footer, and a body); the examiner also submit that a dynamic Web page is created on-the-fly with some parts of the page – the header and the footer – may always be the same, but the main body of the page changes for each new query.

The examiner further submits that an option to select a function is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for an accessible document, a user could make a selection among given choices for displaying (e.g., WordPerfect allows users to high-light a paragraph, and select a specific font for displaying). The claimed action is “able to select” options.

About identifying an offer to buy/sell:

**Bernard et al.** (US Pat. 5,918,213) suggest : in the Abstract:

“An automated product purchasing system allows purchasers to order products

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

via a remote communications medium without having to speak to a sales representative or other human operator. According to the invention, purchasers access the automated product purchasing system and browse among the selections offered. Menu style prompts guide the customer through the various products offered by the automated product purchasing system. Product descriptions are provided to assist the customer in making his or her selections. Where appropriate, product samples are provided to the customer via the communications medium so the customer can evaluate the product prior to purchasing. Examples of product samples include movie previews, sample cuts from music tracks, software demos, and the like. Ordering and purchasing are automated so that human operators are not required to intervene in the process. The use of a membership profile with important customer information facilitates the automation of the process and minimizes the amount of times a repeat customer needs to provide this information.

**Brief Summary Text (22):**

Once a customer has accessed the automated product purchasing system, the customer is permitted to browse through the offered selections and to obtain more information about particular selections in which he or she may be interested. For example, in one embodiment, music, videos, computer software, and other multimedia products are offered for sale by the automated product purchasing system. In this embodiment, users can sample portions of selected titles to determine whether or not it is a product that they would actually like to rent or purchase.

**Brief Summary Text (28):**

According to the invention, customers are provided with the ability to browse through various selections offered by the automated product purchasing system in a number of different ways. In one scenario, a customer

Serial Number: 09/350,952

Art Unit: 3625

is provided with the ability to browse through selections based on a product name. For example, where the product is music, the customer can browse through the available selections based on the artist's name and the titles of the albums available by that artist. This form of browsing is best suited to a customer who knows which particular products he or she is most interested in purchasing.

Detailed Description Text (30):

The present invention is directed toward an automated product purchasing and previewing system which allows purchasers to preview and order products via a remote communications medium without having to speak to a sales representative or other human operator. According to the invention, purchasers (also referred to in this document as callers and shoppers) access the automated product purchasing and previewing system (generally referred to in shorthand as an "automated product purchasing system") and browse the selections offered";

Perkowski suggests in US Pat. 5,950,173 "Detailed Description Text (4):

As illustrated in FIG. 1, the consumer-product information collection, transmission and delivery system of the present invention is generally indicated by reference numeral 1 and comprises an integration of information subsystems, namely: an IPI finding and serving subsystem 2 for allowing consumers to find product related information on the Internet (e.g. WWW) at particular Uniform Resource Locators (URLs), using UPC numbers and/or trademarks and tradenames symbolically-linked or related thereto; a UPC Product-Information Subsystem ("UPC Catalog") 3 for providing retailers with accurate up-to-date product information on numerous consumer-products offered for wholesale to retailers by manufacturers registering there products therewith; a Electronic Trading Information Subsystem 4 for providing trading partners (e.g. a manufacturer and a

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

retailer) to sell and purchase consumer goods by sending and receiving documents (e.g. purchase orders, invoices, advance slip notices, etc.) to consummate purchase and sale transactions using either EDI transmission or Web-based electronic document communications; a Sales Analysis and Forecasting Information Subsystem for providing retailers with information about what products consumers are currently buying at retail stores or expect to be buying in the near future; Collaborative Replenishment Information Subsystem 6 for determining what products retailers can be buying in order to satisfy consumer demand at any given point in time; a Transportation and Logistics Information Subsystem 7 for providing retailers with information about when ordered products (purchased by retailers at wholesale) will be delivered to the retailer's stores; and Input/Output Port Connecting Subsystems 8 for interconnecting the input and output ports of the above-identified subsystems through the infrastructure of the Internet and various value-added EDI networks of global extent. Notably, unlike prior art supply chain management systems, the consumer-product information collection, transmission and delivery system of the present invention embraces the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers of UPC-encoded products, and not simply the manufacturers and retailers thereof. As will become apparent hereinafter, this important feature of the present invention allows manufacturers and retailers to deliver valuable product related information to the consumers of their products, thereby increasing consumer purchases, consumer satisfaction and consumer loyalty. Prior art supply chain management systems simply have no way or means of providing such information services to the consumers of UPC-encoded products along the consumer-product supply and demand chain."; and **Meltzer et al.** (US Pat. 6,226,675 "Detailed Description Text (423):  
For example, the purchase order specified above may be monitored by programs

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

listening for events generated by the parser, which would connect the document or its contents to an order entry program. Receipt of product descriptions within the purchase order, might invoke a program to check inventory. Receipt of address information within the purchase order, would then invoke a program to check availability of services for delivery.

Buyer information fields in the document, could invoke processes to check order history for credit worthiness or to offer a promotion or similar processing based on knowing the identity of the consumer.”)

- locate a digital signature in the header/footer of a catalog (see **Schumacher et al.**, the summary, and Fig.4);
- analyze said signature for authenticity (see **Schumacher et al.**, the abstract).

Shumacher et al. and Mike Heck do not specify a document having an offer to buy and an offer to sell.

However, Ginter et al. obviously suggest a document having these instructions.

It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art for a combination of **Schumacher & Heck** ‘s references in view of Ginter et al. to present a document with different portions in a catalog, because above references are within a field of application in web-based presentations.

B. Re. claim 2: A document of claim 1, wherein said portions can be distributed to servers coupled to a network.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

The examiner further submits that this limitation is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because claimed document merely comprising data; these data would be

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

distributing to servers (assuming that if they are used in a structure such as Internet/Web).

C. Re. claim 3: A document of claim 1, wherein said 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> portion has address information, said address information are configured to permit access to said address.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

The examiner further submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because claimed 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> portion has data, and those data could be address information; therefore, it already defines a location/address for accessing.

D. Re. claim 4: A document of claim 1, wherein the document permits the user to select between URL links and in-line data for presentation of multimedia content.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

The examiner further submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for an accessible document, a user could make a selection among given choices for displaying (e.g., WordPerfect allows users to highlight a paragraph, and select a specific font for displaying). The essential action in claim is "able to select", other supporting information in the phrase are obvious.

E. Re. claim 6: Schumacher et al. suggest a document of claim 5, wherein a digital signature comprises a private key that corresponds to a public key.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 5 are incorporated.

The examiner further submits that this limitation is fundamental (already been

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

defined in dictionaries) to one of ordinary skill in the art because digital signature would utilized both pair of keys: public & private key (e.g., see **Schumacher** et al., the abstract; also see **Ginter** et al., in detailing description text portion (para. 1376)).

F. Re. claim 7: A document of claim 1, wherein elements of documents of different sources can be integrated.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that this limitation is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because elements of a document are merely aggregated data; these data can be "cut" and "paste" to make a modified document (e.g., using MS Words or WordPerfect word processors, a user can integrate elements from different files). This claim is rejected on 35 USC 103(a).

G. Re. claim 8: A document of claim 7, wherein authenticity of an element of a document is achievable by comparison.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 7 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for checking authenticity of an element (e.g., one would check a US \$20 bill by comparing a water-mark or a bill's serial number with a "good" bill).

H. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schumacher** et al. (US Pat. 6,269,446), in view of **Mike Heck**.

**Schumacher** obviously suggest a computer program for:

- locate a digital signature in the footer of said catalog (see **Schumacher**, the

summary, and Fig.4);

- verify said signature for authentication (see **Schumacher**, the abstract).

**Schumacher** fails to suggests to identify elements of an e-catalog, including a header, a footer, and a body; however, **Mike Heck** teaches those items.

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would appreciate a combination of **Schumacher's** patent and **Heck's** ideas for verifying authentication because it has been a common practice of one with ordinary skill in the art to locate and analyze digital signature in a footer of a document for authentication.

I. Re. claim 5: This claim is also directed to a document as in claim 1, wherein a 3<sup>rd</sup> portion contains a digital signature.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

The examiner further submits that claim 9 has a similar claimed limitation; therefore, similar rationales and reference for 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

J. **Claim 10:** This claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dana Mackenzie**, in view of **Mike Heck**.

**Mackenzie** obviously suggest about updating a catalog, comprising:

- determine catalog's information is current; and
- update said catalog (see **Dana Mackenzie's article**).

**Mackenzie** does not expressly identify elements of a catalog, including a header, a footer, and a body. However, **Mike Heck's** article suggests these missing items.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitations are very obvious to one of

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

ordinary skill in the art because for reviewing a catalog, (the "determine catalog's information is current" limitation is assumed coming out with a "TRUE" answer because next step "updating a catalog" must be performed) a user can identify visible portion of that catalog including a header, a footer, and a body (see **Mike Heck**'s article); a computer program could do that task automatically by using pointer/index to jump to each defined portion e.g., a footer, a body, or a header (for instant, an Office Action is created with identified portions: Serial Number of an application (a header), a body (detail actions), or a footer (page number)); this pending claim is rejected on 35 USC 103(a). Then merely determine whether document info. are current or not by just look at that document creation date, if not current, update with current info. This is routinely done by a computer user; therefore, there is nothing incredible about claimed limitations.

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would appreciate a combination of **Mackenzie** and **Heck**'s ideas for verifying authentication because it has been a common practice of one with ordinary skill in the art to update a catalog with current information.

K. Re. claim 11: A computer program of claim 10, wherein a parser determines elements according to time-stamps, and wherein a software deletes out-of-date items.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 10 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that computer programs are well-known for sorting elements by dates/time, and could be programmed to delete old items by comparing to

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

a given date. This claim is obvious to computer programmers.

L. Re. claim 12: A computer program of claim 10, wherein a parser determines elements as modified or unmodified, and wherein modified items are identified.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 10 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that computer programs are well-known to sort elements by modified/unmodified status. This claim is obvious to database programmers.

M. Re. claim 13: A computer program of claim 10, further comprising:

- signature software for signing an updated document.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 10 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that a signature software has been existed prior to this application's priority date. This claim is obvious to computer users for using digital signatures.

N. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Dana Mackenzie**, in view of **Mike Heck**.

**Mackenzie** obviously suggest a computer program for annotation of a catalog, comprising instructions for:

- generate a source document from elements of a catalog (by putting elements together a programmer could easily create a document) (see **Mackenzie** 1:26-31);
- generate a compound document having elements similar to that of the catalog ("compound document" has been known prior to application's priority date, then

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

the only thing to put together element to make that items) (see **Mackenzie** 1:26-28);

- enclose source document within said compound document (see **Mackenzie** 2:29-30); and
- provide an annotation section referring to entries in said source document (see **Mackenzie** 1:42-44).

**Heck** further suggests about identifying elements of a catalog, including a header, a footer, and a body (see **Mike Heck's** article).

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would appreciate a combination of **Mackenzie** and **Heck's** ideas for providing annotations in a catalog because it has been a common practice of one with ordinary skill in the art to give explanation notes in a catalog for users.

O. **Claim 15:** A program of claim 14, further causing a processor to:

- generate a digital signature for verification both the compound document and the authenticity of the source document.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 14 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that instructions to generate a digital signature for use in verification is well-known (e.g., see **Ginter** et al., **Schumacher** et al., or **Hoffberg** et al.)

P. **Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Mike Heck**, in view of **Dana Mackenzie**.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

Mike Heck analogously suggest a program for assisting purchases and sales as claim 16, comprising:

- identify elements of a catalog, including a header, a footer, and a body (see Mike Heck's article).

Mackenzie further suggests to generate a tag in a catalog (see Mackenzie page 1, para. 7-8, page 2, para.1-4) for specifying a transaction type.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitations are very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for a catalog, a user could identify visible portion of that catalog including a header, a footer, and a body; (e.g., an Office Action at USPTO is also created with identified portions: Serial Number of an application (in a header), a body (in detail actions), or a footer (in page number portion)); therefore, this claim's limitation would be from an implementation of Heck by Mackenzie.

A step of generating a tag in a portion of a catalog (e.g., in a header) also was suggested by Mackenzie.

Q. Re. claim 17: A program of claim 16, wherein a tag supports a one-to-one sales model.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 16 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that an intend of use such as a phrase "a tag support a one-to-one sales model" is obvious in a claimed "software program". Therefore, this claim's limitation is equivalent to claim 16's limitation.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

R. Re. claim 18: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 16 are incorporated. It claims a computer program wherein a sales model tag supports one-to-one, many-to-one, and one-to-many sales model.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because a user can use many different sales model (e.g., one-to-one, many-to-one, one-to-many) with a sales tag.

S. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Dana Mackenzie**.

**Mackenzie** obviously suggests:

- means for identify elements of a catalog, including a header, a footer, and a body (see **Mackenzie** pg.1:26-28 & 42-44, pg.2: 1-2, 38-41);
- means for determining a location in a storage medium for storing each element of the catalog; and means for storing elements in their respective location; and means for retrieving those elements for distribution (see **Mackenzie** pg.1, and pg.2:1-2, 29-30).

The examiner submits that one with ordinary skill in the art would appreciate **Mackenzie's** ideas of identifying elements in a catalog because writing a computer program including above suggested ideas of **Mackenzie** would be done at the time of invention.

T. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Dana Mackenzie**.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

Mackenzie suggests a method of providing an electronic catalog, comprising:

- providing a header section;
- providing a body section;
- providing a footer section for verification.
- formatting those sections.

The examiner submits that **Mackenzie** (pg.2: 3-7 and 18-20) obviously suggest above claimed ideas although not expressly disclosing these limitations.

U. Re. claim 21: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

In addition to limitations of claim 20, **Mackenzie** further suggest about distributing elements of a document (see **Mackenzie** 2:27-30).

V. Re. claim 22: A method of claim 21, wherein the distribution of document is via URL links.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 21 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that **Mackenzie** suggests this claimed limitation.

X. Re. claim 23: A method of claim 20, wherein the document permits a user to select between URL links and in-line data for presentation of multimedia content.

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated.

The examiner submits that this claimed limitation is very obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because for an accessible document, a user could make a selection among given choices for displaying (e.g., WordPerfect allows users to high-

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

light a paragraph, and select a specific font (among many different fonts) for displaying)(see also **Brutzman**).

**Y. Re. claim 24:** A method of claim 20, further comprising:

Providing a digital signature in the footer of a catalog.

The examiner submits that the rationale for rejection of this limitation is similar to claim 9.

**Z. Re. claims 26, 28, 30, 32:**

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 20 are incorporated. **Mackenzie** obviously suggests to integrating/assembling elements into a document (see **Mackenzie** pg.2, 29-30).

About claim 32's limitation, the examiner submits that disassembling (e.g., cutting a document into 2 parts and renaming them) step is obvious from Mackenzie's feature.

**W. Re. claims 27, 29, 31, 33:** The examiner submits that the rationale for rejection of these claims' limitations are similar to claim 9 wherein verifying an authenticity of a catalog 's portion or catalog is claimed; therefore, similar rationales and references for 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 20 are applied.

**AB. Re. To claim 35:** This claim is also directed to a method for updating a document.

The examiner submits that claim 35 contains similar limitations as in claim 10; therefore, similar rationales and references for 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 10 are applied.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

AC. Re. To claim 36: This claim is also directed to a method for updating a document.

The examiner submits that claim 36 contains similar limitations as in claim 11; therefore, similar rationales and reference for 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 11 are applied.

AD. Re. To claim 37: This claim is also directed to a method for updating a document.

The examiner submits that claim 37 contains similar limitations as in claim 12; therefore, similar rationales and reference for 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 12 are applied.

AE. Re. To claim 38: This claim is also directed to a method for updating a document.

The examiner submits that claim 38 contains similar limitations as in claim 13; therefore, similar rationales and reference for 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 13 are applied.

AF. Re. To claim 39: The examiner submits that claim 39 contains similar limitations as in claim 14; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

AG. Re. To claim 40: The examiner submits that claim 40 contains similar limitations as in claim 15; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

AH. Re. To claim 41: The examiner submits that claim 41 contains a similar limitation as in claim 16; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

AI. Re. To claim 42: The examiner submits that claim 42 contains similar limitations as in claim 17; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

AJ. Re. To claim 43: The examiner submits that claim 43 contains similar limitations as in claim 18; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103(a) rejection are applied.

AL. Re. To claim 25: The examiner submits that this claim has similar limitations as in claim 6; therefore, similar rationales and references for a 35 USC 103 (a) rejection are applied.

***Conclusion***

6. Claims 1-33, 35-43 are not patentable. Applicant's amendment necessitated new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

Serial Number: 09/350,952  
Art Unit: 3625

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuong H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. from 7:15 AM to 3:15 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Wynn Coggins, can be reached on (703)308-1344.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Amendments

***Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks***

***Washington D.C. 20231***

or faxed to:

**(703)305-7687 [Official communications]**

or 703-746-5572 (RightFax)

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist with telephone: (703)308-1113.

*Cuonghnguyen*  
Primary Examiner  
July 10, 2003